

- r/syosor
- r/Tahiti
- r/Tajmahaltomb
- r/TamilTwenties
- r/tarheels
- r/Tatort
- r/tcltv
- r/TeenMomOGan...
- r/Tegu
- r/Tempe
- r/Thailand
- r/thebachelor
- r/TheBoys
- r/TheGoodPlace
- r/thegrandtour
- r/TheGreatNorth
- r/TheLastAirben...
- r/thelastofus
- r/TheOwlHouse
- r/ThePeripheral
- r/TheSimpsons
- r/thewalkingdead
- r/TheWhiteLotus...
- r/Tikrit
- r/todayilearned
- r/travisscott
- r/Trivandrum
- r/Truckers
- r/Tuvalu
- r/TwoSentenceH...
- r/UNC
- r/USDiaspora
- r/Uyghur
- r/VintageFashion
- r/Watches
- r/Wednesday
- r/Winslow
- r/worldnews
- r/YellowstonePN
- r/Yokohama
- r/ZionNationalPark

RESOURCES

- About Reddit
- Advertise
- Reddit Pro **BETA**
- Help
- Blog
- Careers
- Press

Communities

Best of Reddit

Topics

Reddit Rules

Privacy Policy

User Agreement

Accessibility

←  r/NTU 5 days ago CurveSad2086 CoHASS Influenzas Top 1% Commenter

A transparent response to ST's article: no AI used

Info Sharing

Remarks	Explanation
Santos is not in the reference list	https://cla.auburn.edu/news/articles/food-historian-comments-on-wet-markets-and-covid-19/
Luiz et al. (2023) is in the reference list	The 339% is a manual calculation. There was a mathematical error I made, the correct formula should be 746/158%, which is 472%.
Kim (2020) is in the reference list	Kim's article should be cited in the paragraph later about travel bans instead. The correct citation here for U.S. officials withdrawing funding should be https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/29/health/virus-who.html
Lynteris (2020) is in the reference list but should be cited as Lynteris, Christos. 2020. "Sinophobia, Epidemics, and Interspecies Catastrophe." <i>Hot Spots, Fieldlights</i> , June 23. https://www.culanth.org/fieldlights/sinophobia-epidemics-and-interspecies-catastrophe instead of Lynteris, C. (2020, January 31). Sinophobia, epidemics, and interspecies catastrophe. <i>Society for Cultural Anthropology</i> .	I wanted to standardise the APA formatting, that's why I abbreviated Christos to 'C.' I don't think this is a mistake as the formatting should be consistent in the bibliography.
Should be Lee (2013)	The website which I retrieved the citation from spell Lee as Li: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10565080/#b33-kjmh-28-1-59 , which resulted in this mistake

Hi everyone, I'm the OP behind the AI case and I'm currently texting my prof (who was in the panel) to ask about the ST article and if it's about me, because everyone's confused about the article suddenly dropping.

But I want to state that I do have it in recording that my citation sorter wasn't AI during the hearing. They also could access each link that I provided during the hearing, showing that it wasn't false. You can try accessing the links in the pictures as well.

And also for my typos, I've attached it to this post so you can see that these are spelling errors rather than AI hallucinations. The pic is the same document I provided NTU as well to prove that my citations were real. They have acknowledged this.

During my meeting with NTU this week about my grades, NTU's discussion with me was about my writing, and NTU didn't prove genAI use in my essay. I have told the news outlets about this, and hopefully they'll update it.

NTU didn't give any of us a heads up about the Straits Times article, but I want to transparently put my mistakes here first for viewing, before anyone says anything.

So please don't say anything about me being "non-transparent" or sus. I will provide everything I can. But right now I'm confused about the article as well.

↑ 415


↓ 279

Reply

Share

Single comment thread

See full discussion

 **pricklyheatt** • 5d ago • Edited 5d ago

Eh don't know why my previous comment was deleted.

But, one of the best advice I got is to always keep a low profile and stay silent, especially when in shit.

Edit: and to reply to your comment on my previous comment, you can basically do what you have done, of appealing (\$40?) and all, without posting on Reddit or making this viral on mothership.

The ST article might not be about you and you might be innocent but it's still a shit show that could be avoided.

↑ 32

↓

Reply

Award

Share

...

 Ok_Pattern_6534 • 5d ago

Agree with you 😊

↑ 4

↓

Reply

Award

Share

...

 ikzz1 • 5d ago

She wanted to sway the public opinion to put pressure on NTU. Keeping a low profile wouldn't help because NTU would reject her appeal without a second thought. Now NTU would reject her appeal with a second thought.

↑ 3

↓

Reply

Award

Share

...

 pricklyheatt • 5d ago

Nice, are you clairvoyant?

↑ 5

↓

Reply

Award

Share

...

 Puzzleheaded_Style52 • 4d ago

<Edit School> Could you explain why keeping a low profile would have been better?

↑ 1

↓

Reply

Award

Share

...

 pricklyheatt • 4d ago

Oh you can't see why keeping a low profile would have been better as compared what's happening now?

Where she has to try to 'defend' herself publicly against ST and NTU by posting her work on reddit for strangers to judge? For her to be labelled a liar by internet strangers?

Lol.

↑ 3

↓

Reply

Award

Share

...

 Timely-Tune6009 • 3d ago

just lay low? I think OP's doing a great job in getting awareness and setting precedent to prevent the prof from throwing ai allegations on a whim. Kudos to her for fighting for what she believes is right, and not hiding like a rat if OP didn't do anything wrong.

↑ 1

↓

Reply

Award

Share

...

 pricklyheatt • 3d ago

Agree, kudos to her for dragging herself and everyone else through dirt so publicly.

↑ 3

↓

Reply

Award

Share

...

PROMOTED



90% off FOR 6 MONTHS *Excludes QuickBooks Online Advanced

BEHIND EVERY SUCCESSFUL BUSINESS Buy now

 r/NTU • 3 mo. ago

Everything is messed up

97 upvotes • 7 comments

 r/unimelb • 3 mo. ago

Anyone successfully disputed a false accusation of AI?

56 upvotes • 20 comments

 r/NTU • 4 mo. ago

[Rant] Some people complain about everything but never reflect on themselves

85 upvotes • 8 comments

 r/rupaulsdragrace • 2 mo. ago

Unpacking TS Madison's recent comments: Why it matters to RPDR

3.2K upvotes • 536 comments

 r/NTU • 24 days ago

Application outcome

5 upvotes • 44 comments

 r/NTU • 12 days ago

Being transparent and responsive suffices
ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA
To be the following requirements: